

**Appln No. 09/883,835**  
**Am dt date March 23, 2005**  
**Reply to Office action of January 3, 2005**

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1-8, 10-16, 18-20, and 23-25 are amended.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 12-16, 18, 20 and 24-25 are objected to because of informalities. In view of the amendments to the above claims, it is respectfully requested that the above objections be withdrawn. Applicants further submit that all of the variables in the claimed equations are now defined.

Claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-20, and 22-25 are objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and the above objects are overcome.

Claims 1, 9, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madhow, et al. (IEEE 1994). Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited references, and reconsideration and allowance of these remaining claims are respectfully requested.


Independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 21 include, among other limitations, "updat[ing] weight coefficients of an adaptive filter without prior knowledge of synchronization of the spreading code of the data vector." Madhow does not teach nor does it suggest the above limitation.

Rather, Madhow describes a MMSE interference scheme that "allows filter parameters to be adapted in a straight forward manner without a priori knowledge of the interference parameters." (Page 3186, Conclusion, underlining added.). However, the interference parameters of Madhow's scheme are different from "synchronization of the spreading code of the data vector." The spreading code of the data vector is part of the data signal. In contrast "interference parameters" are just interference (noise) signal and are not part of the data signal. Therefore, there is a key difference between the MMSE interference scheme of Madhow and the claimed invention. As a result, independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 21 are also patentable in view of the cited references.

**Appln No. 09/883,835**  
**Amdt date March 23, 2005**  
**Reply to Office action of January 3, 2005**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By   
Raymond R. Tabandeh  
Reg. No. 43,945  
626/795-9900

RRT/clv  
CLV PAS614478.1-\* 03/23/05 11:19 AM